

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 10-11, 47, 74, and 79 are canceled without prejudice. Claims 2, 4, 8, 9, 12, 14, 16-19, 24-26, 29-32, 34, 40-41, 46, 48, 57, 60, 62, 64, 66-67, 71-73, 78, and 80 are previously presented. Claims 3, 5-7, 13, 15, 20-23, 27-28, 33, 35-39, 42-45, 49-56, 58-59, 61, 63, 65, 68-70, 75-77, and 81-87 are original. Claims 2-9, 12-46, 48-73, 75-78, and 80-87 are pending.

**The §103 Rejections**

Claims 1-22, 24-32, 34-38, and 40-87 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,460,058 to Koppolu et al. (hereinafter "Koppolu") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,275,575 to Wu (hereinafter "Wu"). Applicant notes that claims 1, 10-11, 47, 74, and 79 were canceled without prejudice prior to this action and so assumes that the Office meant to reject claims 2-9, 12-22, 24-32, 34-38, 40-46, 48-73, 75-78, and 80-87 on this basis.

Claims 23, 33, and 39 stand rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable by Koppolu in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,606,606 to Starr.

**Disqualification of Koppolu**

Under MPEP 706.02(I) and 35 U.S.C. §103(c), subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one or more sections (e), (f), and (g) of 35 U.S.C. §102, shall not preclude patentability under 35 U.S.C. §103 where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same

1 person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. With  
2 regard to subject matter of a section 102(e) reference, this law is effective for  
3 applications filed November 29<sup>th</sup>, 1999 and later.

4 The Koppolu reference and this application (Serial No. 09/599,298)  
5 were, at the time the invention of this application was made, owned by or  
6 subject to an obligation of assignment to Microsoft Corporation. This  
7 application was filed after November 29<sup>th</sup>, 1999.

8  
9 **Interview Summary for Interview Dated 3/29/06**

10 As required by 37 CFR 1.133(b), Applicant provides the following  
11 administrative details concerning the interview. First, this case is under  
12 non-final rejection. Second, the participants to the interview were  
13 Examiner Steven Paul Sax and Michael K. Colby. Third, the interview  
14 was conducted over the phone on March 29<sup>th</sup>, 2006.

15 Applicant also provides the following summary of the issues  
16 discussed during the interviews. Applicant's representative and the  
17 Examiner discussed the filing of a statement establishing that the Koppolu  
18 reference and the application were commonly owned at the time of the  
19 invention of the claims of the application.

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1        **Conclusion**

2        Applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for  
3 allowance and respectfully requests that this application be allowed and  
4 forwarded on to issuance.

5  
6                                Respectfully submitted,

7  
8        Dated: 24 Apr 06

9                                By: Michael K. Colby  
10                                Michael K. Colby  
11                                Reg. No. 45,816  
12                                (509) 324-9256 x240